

EXHIBIT “2”

Page 93	Page 95
<p>1 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 6 was marked 2 for identification.) 3 Q. Could you explain to me what you meant by 4 exceeded her authority on several 5 occasions. 6 A. Primarily that would relate to the copier 7 lease where that -- we had discussed 8 obtaining a copier, and we did obtain a 9 copier, and she entered into a lease 10 agreement. Even though the company had 11 discussed the fact that we would do that, I 12 was unaware that she had executed a lease. 13 Q. Was that discussed in one of the management 14 meetings, getting a copier? 15 A. The copier. Not the execution of the lease 16 without an officer signing it. 17 Q. Okay. 18 MR. JACOBS: Let's mark this one 19 as Plaintiff's 7. 20 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 7 was marked 21 for identification.) 22 Q. The next item refers to price decreases 23 from Plextor. Have we discussed that?</p>	<p>1 Q. Did you ever see the agreement that was 2 signed regarding that system? 3 A. I saw parts of the agreement. I don't know 4 that I knew specifically about that. It 5 was Ms. McCollum's responsibility. For 6 Amtren's benefit, that had to be a fully 7 integrated system. It was my understanding 8 with her we would obtain a turnkey fully 9 integrated system, and I subsequently 10 approved her to spend the moneys that we 11 did on that. I do not recall looking 12 specifically at the details of the contract 13 to that extent. 14 Q. Was there a specific amount of money that 15 you approved for her to spend? 16 A. I don't think it was specific, but I think 17 we do -- we did discuss the numbers that we 18 ended up paying. I don't know the exact 19 numbers, but I do think 20 or \$30,000. The 20 issue was not really the financial part so 21 much as to make sure it was turnkey; that 22 it was to be fully implemented. 23 Q. Okay. So if I can restate, and you tell me</p>
Page 94	Page 96
<p>1 A. That was the item we talked about. 2 Q. All right. Which of her duties pertaining 3 to the purchase of MAS90 did she not 4 perform adequately? 5 A. The integration of MAS90 was discussed 6 extensively at the end of 2004, and we had 7 generated a document to sit down and review 8 this process. The undertaking would be 9 significant. It was my understanding that 10 as Ms. McCollum moved forward with that, 11 she would seek integrated services, turnkey 12 integrated services from the vendors that 13 we were discussing. She handled the 14 discussions with the vendors and sought the 15 bidding and was subsequently awarded the 16 bid. At that time -- and it wasn't until 17 later did I know that we did not submit -- 18 we did not obtain a fully integrated 19 package. We obtained a package that was 20 partially integrated that we would 21 subsequently have to -- I guess the word is 22 enter the data on our own later to 23 completely fulfill it.</p>	<p>1 if I'm wrong. Is it fair to say that what 2 you're complaining of there is the fact 3 that she did not contract with Wilson, 4 Price for a completely installed and 5 implemented system? 6 A. Yes. That is a pretty fair assumption. 7 There are a lot of terms that have been 8 passed around about integration of MAS90. 9 The issue that we had was pretty much in 10 line with what you said. 11 Q. Okay. And is that also the basis for your 12 complaint, the next one, that she released 13 Wilson, Price prior to the complete and 14 satisfactory conversion to the new 15 accounting system? 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. Who was your technical assistance person 18 from Wilson, Price in implementation of 19 that system? 20 A. Bobby Lake. 21 Q. Okay. Do you know if Bobby Lake ever 22 complained to Wilson, Price regarding any 23 lack of appropriate performance on the part</p>